Case 1:25-cv-04900-ALC Document 4 Filed 06/11/25 Page 1 of 2

IH-32 Rev: 2014-1

United States District Court Southern District of New York Related Case Statement

Full Caption of Later Filed Case:

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ASSISTANCE PROJECT, INC.

Plaintiff

vs.

U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

Defendant

etendant

Full Caption of Earlier Filed Case:

(including in bankruptcy appeals the relevant adversary proceeding)

ASYLUM SEEKER ADVOCACY PROJECT

Plaintiff

vs.

U.S. CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES

Defendant

IH-32 Rev: 2014-1

Status of Earlier Filed Case:

	Closed	(If so, set forth the procedure which resulted in closure, e.g., voluntary dismissal, settlement, court decision. Also, state whether there is an appear pending.)
✓	Open	(If so, set forth procedural status and summarize any court rulings.)

A briefing schedule for a preliminary injunction was vacated on March 25, 2025 after the sole document requested in the proceeding had been released in a separate proceeding and Defendant U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services ("USCIS") issued a letter granting Plaintiff ASAP's request for expedited processing. See ASAP v. USCIS, No. 1:25-cv-02133-ALC (S.D. N.Y. Mar. 14, 2025), ECF Nos. 12, 15. The parties continue to provide joint status reports as they determine whether it is possible to resolve the case without litigation. See id., ECF No. 15.

Explain in detail the reasons for your position that the newly filed case is related to the earlier filed case.

This case addresses substantially similar legal claims under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") as in the earlier filed case, ASAP v. USCIS, No. 1:25-cv-02133-ALC (S.D. N.Y. Mar. 14, 2025). Like in ASAP v. USCIS, this case arises from the denial of a request for expedited production, without explanation, of an undisclosed federal policy impacting thousands of noncitizens, by Defendant U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services—the named defendant in ASAP v. USCIS, and here.

Additionally, both cases present factually similar circumstances. Both cases implicate an indefinite administrative pause on pending immigration benefit requests filed by noncitizens (parolees in ASAP v. USCIS; refugees and asylees in this case).

Additionally, it is likely that both of the federal policies originated from the same office within USCIS, given the proximity in timing of the announcement of each policy (February 2025 for ASAP v. USCIS; March 2025 in this case).

Finally, both cases implicate a similar type of document: a very narrow universe of documents, perhaps a single document in this case, and in fact, a single three-page document in ASAP v. USCIS.

Signature: /s/Pedro Sepulveda, Jr.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ASSISTANCE PROJECT, INC. (IRAP)

Date: 06/11/2025